Page - 1

2
3
4

5

6

7 8

9

1112

1314

1516

17

1819

2021

22

2324

25

2627

28

noted for consideration on the court's January 14, 2005, motion calendar. Defendant's give proof that the motion was faxed and a hardcopy was mailed to plaintiff. Noting that plaintiff had failed to respond to their motion, defendants filed a reply brief, which also appears to have been properly served on plaintiff. To date, plaintiff has failed to respond the dispositive motion.

Defendants' motion to dismiss raises a statute of limitations defense and the issue of court jurisdiction based on plaintiff's alleged failure to successfully challenge the fact and duration of his confinement via a writ of habeas corpus prior to seeking any cognizable damages as sought in this Complaint in this matter. In support of their motion to dismiss, defendants cite adequate legal authority and documentation supporting their arguments. Without rebuttal evidence or argument, the Court should find defendants' arguments persuasive. Without any opposition brief, the court should find plaintiff admits defendants' motion has merit.

CONCLUSION

Because plaintiff has not responded to defendant's motion to dismiss and defendants have offered sufficient evidence to support their motion for summary judgment, the Court should GRANT defendants motion and plaintiff's causes of action should be dismissed.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the parties shall have ten (10) days from service of this Report to file written objections. *See also* Fed.R.Civ.P. 6. Failure to file objections will result in a waiver of those objections for purposes of appeal. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Accommodating the time limit imposed by Rule 72(b), the clerk is directed to set the matter for consideration on **May 13, 2005**, as noted in the caption.

DATED this 21st day of April, 2005.

/s/ J. Kelley Arnola

J. Kelley Arnold

U.S. Magistrate Judge